

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 are amended. Claim 16 is added. The amendments do not add new matter and support for the amendments may be found throughout the Specification. Entry of the amendments at this time is proper.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application respectfully are requested. The amendments, in conjunction with the following remarks, are believed to place the application in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the amendments and favorable reconsideration of the application respectfully are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that the Examiner indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 20, 2001, has been considered.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication on page 4 of the Office Action that claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 9 is amended to correct a typographical error.

Office Action

Claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 405032138 (Kenmotsu). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by Kenmotsu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Anticipation

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kenmotsu. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

To anticipate, the applied art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants maintain that Kenmotsu does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 1. Specifically, Kenmotsu does not disclose "a guide means for movably guiding said installing means along the longitudinal direction of the mobile body," as recited in claim 1.

Kenmotsu relates to a structure of arrangement of an electrical fitting box. A computer for control of a car, a diagnostic monitor, and other electrical fitting items are accommodated in box 5. Box 5 is installed with the overpart opened at the floor surface between driver seat 1 and assistant driver seat 2, and console box 6 of overlaid lid structure is mounted over the opening using fasteners 7. Kenmotsu, however, does not disclose

a guide means for movably guiding the installing means along the longitudinal direction of the car.

In contrast, the claimed invention recites "a guide means for movably guiding said installing means along the longitudinal direction of the mobile body." This configuration allows the installing means to move between the seats in a mobile body, such as a car or van. Thus, the installing means is accessible to other passengers in the mobile body instead of just the driver seat and assistant driver seat.

Referring to Kenmotsu, box 5 is installed between driver seat 1 and assistant driver seat 2. Neither box 5, nor any of its components, can move along a guiding means. In fact, Applicants submit that a guiding means is not disclosed by Kenmotsu. Applicants, however, amend the claims in order to further prosecution to recite "movably guiding" the installing means. Kenmotsu does not disclose this feature. Thus, claims 1 and 12 are not anticipated by Kenmotsu. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections and claims 1 and 12.

Obviousness

Claim 6 is rejected as allegedly rendered obvious by Kenmotsu. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish obviousness, the Office Action must meet three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. MPEP § 2143. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not establish obviousness with respect to claim 6.

As noted above, the applied art must disclose or suggest all the claimed limitations. Applicants note that claim 6 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed with regard to anticipation, Kenmotsu does not disclose all the features of claim 1, nor does Kenmotsu suggest these features. Specifically, Kenmotsu does not suggest "a guide means for movably guiding said installing means along the longitudinal direction of the mobile body." Referring to Figure 1 of Kenmotsu, box 5 is not movable along a guide means. Nothing in Kenmotsu suggests this feature. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Kenmotsu suggests this feature. Thus,

all the claimed limitations of the present invention are not disclosed or suggested by the applied art.

Moreover, independent claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the applied art. Claim 6 depends from claim 1. If an independent claim is not obvious, then any claim depending from the independent claim is not obvious. MPEP § 2143.03. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 6 is not rendered obvious by Kenmotsu. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection to claim 6.

New Claim

Applicants submit new claim 16 to advance additional embodiments of the present invention. Claim 16 recites features similar to claim 1, and is distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact William F. Nixon (Reg. No. 44,262) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By *Clint Borden*
MICHAEL K. MUTTER, #29,680

MKM/WFN/kpc/kss

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000